



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

AUTHORSHIP AND INTERPRETATION OF THE  
'ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΜΟΥΣΙΚΗΣ 'ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ

τοῦ Αἰσχύλου βίου

At the end of the Medicean manuscript of Aeschylus there is a brief literary criticism of Aeschylus, entitled ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας. This title is written as a rubric. The text, entire or partly abridged, is found in all the editions of the *Vita Aeschyli*. (Sections 17-18 *De Aeschyli Vita et Poesi Testimonia Veterum*, by Fred. Schoell, incorporated in Ritschl's *Aeschyli Septem adversus Thebas*. Leipsig. 1875.)

Unfortunately, few commentators have ever treated these sections of the *Vita Aeschyli*. Those who have treated them have done so in the briefest manner. The bibliography is meager and scattered. Frederick Schoell, who has so ably gathered together the "Testimonia Veterum" for the *Vita Aeschyli*, made no comment on these sections of the *Vita*. F. Susemihl (*De Vita Aeschyli Quaestiones Epicriticae*) gives them only scant notice. In his edition of Aeschylus and the *Vita*, Paley, though he translates the rest of the *Vita*, furnishes a translation of only the first section of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας, and adds no comment.

I submit below what testimony of the ancient and modern commentators in regard to these sections I was able to find. I attempt, too, to supply an interpretation of this passage.

I give a composite text but I have followed, as far as possible, the reading of cod. M. of Aeschylus. I have added but few emendations.

My references to Aeschylus are from Sidgwick's *Aeschyli Tragoediae*. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1899.

TEXT

ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας

(1.) Ταύτη καὶ ἄριστος εἰς τραγωδίαν κρίνεται. Αἰσχύλος, ὅτι εἰσάγει πρόσωπα μεγάλα καὶ ἀξιόχρεα. καὶ τινες ἤδη τῶν τραγωδιῶν αὐτῷ διὰ μόνων οἰκονομοῦνται θεῶν, καθάπερ οἱ Προμηθεῖς· τὰ γὰρ δράματα συμπληροῦσιν οἱ πρεσβύτατοι τῶν θεῶν, καὶ ἐστὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τῆς ὀρχήστρας θεῖα πάντα πρόσωπα.—

(2.) Ἰστέον ὡς οὐ κατὰ τὸν κοινὸν λόγον ἐν Καυκάσῳ φησὶ δεδέσθαι Προμηθεά ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοῖς Εὐρωπαίοις τέρμασι τοῦ Ὠκεανοῦ, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς τὴν Ἰῶ λεγομένων ἔστι συμβαλεῖν.

(3.) τῶν ποιημάτων ἃ μὲν ἐστὶ διεξοδικὰ καὶ διηγηματικά, καὶ ἀπαγγελτικά, ἃ δὲ δραματικά καὶ μυητικά, ἃ δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ἃ δὲ μόνον δραματικά. αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ καὶ λέγει ἅμα τὰ πρόσωπα καὶ αὐτὰ τὸ κῦρος ἔχει. διὰ τοῦτο αἱ τῶν δραμάτων ἐπιγραφαὶ προγράφονται τοῦ ποιητοῦ· Νιόβη Αἰσχύλου. Ὀμήρου δὲ Ἰλιάς· μικταὶ γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ποιήσεις αὐτῷ.

2. cod. M. δαιμόνων; Robortellius coni. διὰ μόνων. Corregit Ritschelius διὰ μόνων.

3. τὰ γὰρ . . . ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ Paley.

6-8. Omisere Ritschelius, Weilius, et ceteri. 6. Vid. schol. ad Prom. 1.

9. τῶν ποιημάτων cod. M.: coniecit Robortellius τὰ εἶδη τῶν ποιημάτων ἃ μὲν et cetera.

13. cod. M. αὐτῶν *non* αὐτοῦ cum στ. Weilius Coniecit αὐτῷ bene mihi acceptum. Robortellius recentissimi grammatici adiecit excerptum, servatum etiam in cod. Oxon. Vid. *Aeschyli Septem adversus Thebas*, edid. F. Ritschelius, p. 7, not. 2.

## TRANSLATION

### FROM THE LITERARY HISTORY

In this respect also Aeschylus is judged to be the best in tragedy, because he introduces great and dignified characters. Some of his plays, indeed, are treated by him through the gods alone, as those plays entitled "Prometheus"; for the oldest and most honored of the gods fill up entirely these dramas; and all the characters, both on the stage and in the orchestra, are divine.

<sup>1</sup> Ritter and Westermann add, after μικταὶ γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ποιήσεις αὐτῷ, two other sections numbered in Ritter 21 and 22, which are not found in codices Gudianus, in Oxoniensis, nor in M. These sections have in reality come down to us with Robortello's edition as the only source. It was, however, put together by the same scribe who compiled *ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας*. Whether it is from the same source, however, that he made use of for sections 1 and 3 of the *Vita Aeschyli* we can not well tell.

2) It is to be noted that Aeschylus does not say that Prometheus, according to the common tradition, was bound on Mount Caucasus; but near the European boundaries of Oceanus, as can be inferred from the responses he makes to Io.

3) Of these poems, some are full of details, descriptive and narrative; others, dramatic and imitative; still others combined of both; while others are only dramatic; for the characters themselves act and speak at the same time, and they themselves are supreme. The titles of the dramas are, therefore, written before the name of the poet, as the Niobe of Aeschylus; but we say Homer's Iliad; for the poems of the latter are mixed.

### THE AUTHENTICITY OF SECTION 2

Sec. 2. ἰστέον ὥς . . . . ἔστι συμβαλεῖν, is omitted by most editors. It occurs also at the bottom of the forty-fourth page of the Medicean Ms. of Aeschylus, under the eleventh verse of the Prometheus; and consequently some editors, thinking that it belongs to the Hypothesis of the Prometheus, have omitted it here. In the *Vita Aeschyli* of codex M., however, it is incorporated into the text of the part inscribed ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας. In cod. M., line 4, page 85, ends with πρόσωπα and is followed by a colon and a dash; line 5 begins with ἰστέον ὥς; then after συμβαλεῖν come another colon and a dash. Line 6 begins τῶν ποιημάτων ἃ μὲν . . . . . κ. τ. λ.

In the Prometheus, in which the sentence ἰστέον . . . . . συμβαλεῖν is written at the bottom of page 44 of cod. M., we have ἰστέον ὅτι over against ἰστέον ὥς of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας; and besides, the chirography of these two lines in the MS., below vs. 11 of the Prometheus, is the same hand that wrote the scholia, viz m2. It was an after-thought of this writer of the scholia, who took it from the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας, and who thought it a good note to place here.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>From the characteristics of the hand of the ἰστέον ὅτι . . . . . συμβαλεῖν in the Prometheus, I should be almost certain that this hand was not m1, who wrote the Hypothesis to the Prometheus. Wecklein reads it, however, in his edition of the Prometheus at the bottom of the

Putting the weight, however, as I do, in cod. M., and owing to the manner in which it is written at the bottom of page 44 of cod. M. as by m2, I should also follow Sidgwick, and consider ἰστὸν ὥς . . . συμβαλεῖν as originally written in the ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας. Then, too, it has specific reference to the Prometheus in sec. 1, and is easily reconciled; for in the preceding lines, the writer has been discussing the particular examples contained in the plays entitled "Prometheus".<sup>3</sup>

Many editors of the *Vita Aeschyli* wish to take the phrase ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας with the preceding sentence of the *Vita*, ἀναδιδάξαι τοὺς . . . καὶ λίαν εὐδοκμεῖν and to begin the next sentence with Ταῦτη καὶ. Others read ἔκ τῆς μ. ἱστορίας with Ταῦτη καὶ ἄριστος. Näke<sup>4</sup> says that ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας was inserted by the scribe between εὐδοκμεῖν and ταῦτη, as the title of the following, just as ὁ βίος Αἰσχύλου is written at the beginning of the *Vita*; and he adds that no one had thought of this before his time, simple though it be.<sup>5</sup> Westermann, too, thinks that ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας should be written as a rubric. This opinion and the arguments by which Schoell tries to prove that the words ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας should not be joined to the preceding, but taken as a rubric, as Westermann does, are very plausible.<sup>6</sup> Näke does not follow Susemihl, Sidgwick and Ritschl in writing ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας as a rubric, but merely leaves it in the text, set off by periods.<sup>7</sup>

Hypothesis. Neither Westermann nor Ritschl keeps this section in his text.

<sup>3</sup> Προμηθεὺς λυόμενος, Προμηθεὺς δεσμώτης, Προμηθεὺς πυρφόρος, Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεὺς.

<sup>4</sup> *Opuscula Philologica*, p. 201. Cod. Gudianus supports Näke's theory.

<sup>5</sup> Näke: "Sententia tam plana, ut mirum esse debeat, si nemini ante me in mentem venerit".

<sup>6</sup> Compare Susemihl (*De Vita Aeschyli Quaestiones Epicritae*): "Magis speciosae sunt ceterae rationes, quibus non pro inscriptione sed pro scriptione habenda esse verba Vitae ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας demonstrare Schoellius conatur".

<sup>7</sup> Westermann also punctuates thus in his text, though he thinks it a rubric.

### Discussion of the Meaning of; and Notes on Sections 1-3

Let us now discuss at length the interpretation of some of the subtleties of this curious piece of literary criticism appended to the *Vita Aeschyli*.

1) καθάπερ οἱ Προμηθεῖς—"as the plays entitled 'Prometheus' ". —This refers to the four plays of Aeschylus<sup>8</sup> :—(1) Προμηθεὺς δεσμώτης, which alone is extant; (2) Προμηθεὺς πυρφόρος, which refers to Prometheus's stealing the fire for mortal's use, though the argument is uncertain;<sup>9</sup> (3) Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεὺς; (4) Προμηθεὺς λυόμενος.

The Chorus is here composed of Titans.<sup>10</sup> Prometheus is bound on Mount Caucasus.<sup>11</sup> Heracles<sup>12</sup> is, perhaps, the main character. Herein, the Titans address Prometheus. In the Προμηθεὺς δεσμώτης Hermes taunts<sup>13</sup> Prometheus with the fact that he may be freed when some god shall sacrifice himself to endure the pangs of hell, and be willing to go to gloomy Hades, to the murky depths of Tatarus. This, too, is no vaunt. In all these plays the gods are the leading characters of the dramas.

(2.) οἱ πρεσβύτατοι τῶν θεῶν: The reference here to "the oldest and most honored of the gods" is surely to the divine characters in the four plays concerning Prometheus: Oceanus of Prometheus Bound; the Titans in the Chorus of the Προμηθεὺς λυόμενος; Kronos; Zeus's usurping the power of Kronos;<sup>14</sup> Atlas; Hephaistos; and the other gods of old. We might even, perhaps, con-

<sup>8</sup> Vid. Harry's *Prometheus*, Introduction, p. 92 ff. I have followed the order of the catalogue of the plays in cod. M. Vid. Ritschl's *Septem*, Introduction, p. 24. Vid. also W. Bannier, *Reinisches Museum* (N. F.) 1900, vol. LV. p. 479. Also A. Dieterich, *Rh. Mus.* (N. F.) 1893, vol. XLVIII, p. 11 ff. Προμηθεὺς πυρκαεὺς belongs to the lost fifth column of cod. M.; (Vid. Dieterich loc. cit.) and is considered a Satyr play.

<sup>9</sup> Sidgwick, *Aeschylus's Fragments*, 208-208 a.

<sup>10</sup> Not in Cod. M. Vid. Sidgwick, *Aeschylus's Fragments*, 206-207.

<sup>11</sup> Fragment 190 of Arrians *Periplus* (Hudson, 99.22).

<sup>12</sup> Compare Cicero's *Tusc. Disput.*, 2.10; 23-25, where Cicero says: "Affixus ad Caucasum haec dixit et cetera".

<sup>13</sup> Compare Aeschylus's *Prometheus* vss. 1007-1036.

<sup>14</sup> Compare Wecklein's *Hypothesis to the Prometheus of Aeschylus*.

sider Heracles, and Prometheus himself, as being among οἱ πρεσβύτατοι τῶν θεῶν.<sup>15</sup>

(3.) καί τινες ἤδη τῶν τραγῳδιῶν κ.τ.λ. The writer of the ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας speaks of the working out of the plots of some of Aeschylus' plays by means of divine will and fate, decisions made by omnipotent Zeus and carried out by his retinue of gods and goddesses. Let us here compare and consider the characters of the Prometheus. Κράτος and Βία are considered gods, the personification of overwhelming force, physical force brought to bear upon Prometheus, Force and Strength, ever admired by the Greeks, deified and personified. They act parts, although Βία as a character is mute, and only referred to. Hephaistos and Prometheus are immortalized heroes of mythology.<sup>16</sup> Ὀκεανός, Ἑρμης, Γῆ, Ἡρακλῆς, and the chorus, composed of nymphs, the daughters of Oceanus, make up the rest of the cast. The nymphs throughout Greek literature were considered divine.<sup>17</sup>

(4.) ἰστέον ὡς κ.τ.λ.. The scene<sup>18</sup> of the drama is laid in some barren place on a solitary crag, near the outskirts of the world,<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Prometheus calls himself a god in *Prometheus Bound*, vs. 119:

ὄρατε δεσμώτην με δύσποτμον θεόν  
τὸν Διὸς ἐχθρόν, κ.τ.λ..

<sup>16</sup> Compare Aeschylus's description of him in his *Prometheus*.

<sup>17</sup> Compare Theocritus (von Wilam. Moell.), VII. 135; I. 67-69. Also Bernhard. Schmidt, *Das Volksleben d. Neugriechen*.

<sup>18</sup> Compare Fred. D. Allen, *A. J. P.*, vol. XIII. p. 51-61; von Wilamowitz, *Die Bühne des Aischylos*, in *Hermes*, vol. XXI, p. 603 ff.; B. Foss, *De loco in quo Prometheus apud Aeschylum vinctus est*. (Dissert.) 1862. Meyer P. J., *Aeschyli Prometheus vinctus quo in loco agi videatur*. (Dissert.) 1861. Xanthopoulos. K. Αἰσχύλου Προμηθεὺς δεσμώτης Ἑμμετρος παράφρασις κ. τ. λ.

<sup>19</sup> *Prometheus*, 281 ff. καὶ νῦν ἐλαφρῷ ποδὶ κραιπνόσυτον

θᾶκον προλιποῦς, αἰθέρα θ' ἄγνόν

πόρον οἰωνῶν, ὀκρυοέσση

χθονὶ τηδε πελώ, τοὺς σοὺς δὲ πόνους κ. τ. λ.

Also *Prometheus*, 270 ff.

οὐ μὴν τι ποιναῖς γ' ὀφώμην τοῖαισί με

κατισχνανεῖσθαι πρὸς πέτραις πεδαρσίοις,

τυχόντ' ἐρήμου τοῦδ' ἀγέιτονος πάγου.

Here we can see the character of Prometheus confirmed.

perhaps in Scythia, on the very edge of the continent, at the boundaries of Europe and the Ocean. Thus Oceanus is appropriately introduced.

P. J. Meyer, in his dissertation,<sup>20</sup> says: "Persuasum habeo spectatores primis sex versibus fabulae recitatis statim de Caucaso cogitasse". Yet in regard to the crux of the whole matter, according to F. D. Allen, we have no definite evidence, even in the *Prometheus*, that the scene was laid and enacted on Mount Caucasus, unless we regard as such the belief of Cicero and Strabo, who had the plays extant at the time before them; and the opinion of antiquity generally that Caucasus was the place of Prometheus's punishment. Allen quotes section 2 of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας as evidence, but accepts it only as the foot-note (under l. 11 of the *Prometheus* in cod. M.) under the Hypothesis of the *Prometheus*.

(5.) πρὸς τοῖς Εὐρωπαϊοῖς τέρμασι τοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ κ. τ. λ. This is vouched for in the *Prometheus* in the very opening verses of the play.<sup>21</sup> We know, too, that Prometheus was bound in the West, from what he says to Io,<sup>22</sup> just as the writer of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας states that ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς τὴν Ἰὼ λεγομένων ἔστι συμβαλεῖν.

6. οὐ κατὰ τὸν κοινὸν λόγον ἐν Καυκάσῳ φασὶ δεδεσθαι κ. τ. λ. Here the scholiast, or writer of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας, is right in saying that Prometheus was not bound on Mount Caucasus, as the general tradition states. For the treatment of Aeschylus,<sup>23</sup> at least from the general description of the place previously discussed, would disprove it, even if it were not for *Prometheus* II.

<sup>20</sup> *Aeschyli Prometheus vinctus quo in loco agi videatur*. (Dissert.) 1861.

<sup>21</sup> *Prometheus* II., 1-2.

χθονὸς μὲν ἐς τηλουρὸν ἤκομεν πέδον  
Σκύθην ἐς οἶμον, ἄβατον εἰς ἐρημίαν.

<sup>22</sup> *Prometheus*, 707 ff.

πρῶτον μὲν ἐνθὲνδ ἡλίου πρὸς ἀντολὰς  
στρέψασα σαντὴν στεῖχ' ἀνηρότους γύας.

<sup>23</sup> Yet in the *Prometheus Unbound* of Aeschylus according to Arrian I. c. 190, Prometheus was bound on Mount Caucasus: "Affixus ad Caucasum haec dixit—".



718-719. In giving his instructions to Io for her journey, Prometheus himself says that leaving the rocks on which he was bound and going eastward, she would reach the Scythians, and then beyond the Chalybes, she would come to the river Hybristis. Lines 718-719, however, settle the question absolutely as to whether he was bound on Mount Caucasus, or not.<sup>24</sup>

(7.) ὥς ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς τὴν Ἰὼ λεγομένων ἔστι συμβαλεῖν . . . .  
 . . . This, apparently from the *Prometheus* itself, does not refer specifically to any one statement in the sentence, but generally to the whole sentence.

(8.) καὶ αὐτὰ τὸ κῦρος ἔχει.—The subject of ἔχει is πρόσωπα, who by acting and speaking gain favor for themselves, and not for the poet, by whom they were brought upon the stage. The poet remains hidden, and never speaks himself. As a result of this in giving the titles of fabulae, or any other literary productions, certain rules as to the arrangement of the words of the title were observed. In reference to the fabulae, the ancient custom was “fabulae alicuius”. At the time of the presentation of the drama, the author might oftentimes be unknown.<sup>25</sup> The name of the writer might temporarily be of little interest to the spectators. In giving the title, however, of such a book as the *Iliad*, Homer precedes the word *Iliad*, as Homer was known to all, and his fame was well established. Hence in order to explain such a custom the writer of this treatise has given two well known examples viz: Νιόβη Αἰσχύλου; and on the other hand Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάς. He prefaces his examples by διὰ τοῦτο αἱ τῶν δραμάτων ἐπιγραφαὶ προγράφονται τοῦ ποιητοῦ. The expression διὰ τοῦτο is used for the purpose of showing that it is a conclusion, drawn deductively from what precedes and not merely a detached didactic illustration. In his Preface to the *Andria* of Terence,<sup>26</sup> Donatus says: “Pronuntiataque est Andria Terentii (non Te-

<sup>24</sup> *Prometheus*, 718 ff.

ὃν μὴ περάσῃς, οὐ γὰρ εὐβατος περᾶν,  
 πρὶν ἂν πρὸς αὐτὸν Καύκασον μόλῃς, ὁρᾶν  
 ὕψιστον, ἐνθα ποταμὸς ἔκφυσ᾽ ἰένος — κ. τ. λ.

<sup>25</sup> Compare the preface to the *Andria* of Terence by Donatus.

rentii Andria) ob incognitum adhuc nomen poetae et minoris apud populum auctoritatis ac meriti". Still 'Ομήρου Ἰλιάς may have been written as an apology for the statement made above, while the scribe, knowing the exceptions to this rule, corrects himself.<sup>26</sup>

This troublesome phrase signifies, perhaps, that, since the characters on the stage are those who have the power to affect the audience by their words and dramatic action—even though they are the invention and fabrication of the author's brain—they nevertheless, gain the credit for themselves. The fantastic imagination and histrionic ability in depicting character is felt by the audience to be due to the stage skill of the characters themselves, and not to the ability of the author. The author is forgotten. He is, at least forgotten during the performance, and, perhaps, remembered only afterwards.

The play, the plot, and the portrayal of character are the most important parts of a drama. The author is, however, subordinated to a second place by the subtle power of the human mind to make unrealities real, and to compel reason to be subservient to imagination. By means of a transitional phrase διὰ τοῦτο, the author, therefore, whosoever he be, states that for this reason in giving the titles of plays, the author's name, since it is of less importance, follows the title of the play.

(9.) προγράφονται. Westermann thinks that between προγράφονται τοῦ ποιητοῦ and Νιόβη Αἰσχύλου something is lacking: he considers it faulty that examples should have been added so soon, before

<sup>26</sup> And yet the later plays of Terence are different. We find *Andria Terenti*, *Hauton Timorumenos Terenti*, *Eunuchus Terenti*; but in the last three plays—*Terenti Phormio*, *Terenti Hecyra*, *Terenti Adelphoe*. If this rule of Donatus is true, why does he not make note of the last three plays of Terence as exceptions? The Greek plays also violate this rule, e. g. Αἰσχύλου Ἀγαμέμνων. This is true, too, in the citations by scholiasts, e. g. παρὰ Αἰσχύλου ἐν τῷ Προμηθεΐ. I find, however, that the mss. give Εὐριπίδου Ἑκάβη (Vid Wecklein's *Hecuba*), and that Hypothesis I of Aristophanes' *Plutus* writes ἐπιγεγράφται δὲ τὸ δρᾶμα Πλουτοῦτος Ἀριστοφάνους. Compare Schneidewin's article on the Hypothesis, *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft*, VI. S. 1, (1852).

sufficient explanation had been made to give the reader a full solution of the problem. Westermann further thinks, too, that these statements are epitomized and transferred from some other writer—an opinion I shall later show to be correct. “The scribe wished to say this,” says Westermann, “that in producing dramas on the stage, since the characters themselves spoke and acted, the fabulae were entitled by the name of one of the characters who took part in the play, as for example the Niobe of Aeschylus, but otherwise poems that were not dramatic in their character were entitled differently, as Homer’s *Iliad*”.

(10.) We come now to the most important point of the whole meager piece, which I have, with due apology to the natural order of notation, purposely held back to the last.

τῶν ποιημάτων ἃ μὲν ἐστὶ κ.τ.λ. Here the author of the ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας of the *Vita Aeschyli* has given us four classes of ποιημάτων. Class I: The Descriptive and Narrative; Class II: Dramatic and Imitative; Class III: A combination of I and II; Class IV: The Dramatic alone.<sup>27</sup>

This classification, though somewhat different from that of Plato’s and though it is greatly abridged, goes back to *Res Publica*, 393 ff., where Plato, in deciding what poetry should be allowed in his ideal republic, gives us, first, a division of subject matter; then, a criticism of style. All later criticisms of literary works and style and even of form indubitably come directly or indirectly from these divisions and classifications laid down by Plato. So, first, let us consider Plato’s discussion, which, in many aspects, is quite similar to section 3 of the ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας. I give a short synopsis of Plato’s conception of the form of poetry:

“All composition is in a certain sense narrative, narrating things past, present, and future. Narration, in this sense may be either simple and unmixed or imitative; or, both simple and

<sup>27</sup> Compare section 3 of the ἔκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας. Weil in his reading of οὐδὲ for ἀ δὲ δραματικά etc. thus makes only three classes, a division which conforms more nearly to the classifications of Plato and Aristotle.

imitative.<sup>28</sup> Homer furnishes us an example of this third kind; his poetry is purely narrative when he is speaking in "propria persona"; it is imitative when he puts his own words into the mouth of any one of his characters. Tragedy and comedy are examples of the imitative style. The best example of the purely narrative, of the third or mixed variety is the epic."

Of his first classification, Plato says that all mythology and poetry is a narration of that which has been, is, or will be.<sup>29</sup> Then in order to classify more definitely the narration, Plato divides it into three classes or subdivisions,<sup>30</sup> viz: simple narration; imitation; or a combination of the two. Plato proceeds then to analyze the dramatic element in the epic. He discusses, first, the opening lines of Homer's *Iliad* as an example of the epic—the scene between Agamemnon and Chryses, where he points out that, in narration, the poet's character shows itself; but, when the poet takes, as it were, first the character of Chryses, for example, and then that of Agamemnon, in that case we should call the poem both narrative and imitative.<sup>31</sup> Plato thinks the difference between pure narrative and the imitative is to be found by determining whether the poet appears before us always, and is never concealed, or whether he imitates the various characters, subordinating his own character to those of his work. Speaking here of the exact antithesis of such a condition,<sup>32</sup> the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας has καὶ λέγει ἅμα τὰ πρόσωπα καὶ αὐτὰ τὸ κῦρος ἔχει; but αὐτὰ τὸ κῦρος ἔχει is, I think, only a shorter way of saying what Aristotle states in his *Ars Poetica*, 1448a.<sup>33</sup> Plato, then, in order to show what he means by simple narration,

<sup>28</sup> Compare Plato's *Res Publica*, 392 ff.

<sup>29</sup> Plato's *Rep.*, 392 d. ff.

<sup>30</sup> Plato's *Rep.*, 392 d. ff.

<sup>31</sup> Plato's *Rep.*, 393 c.

<sup>32</sup> *Rep.* 393 d: εἰ δὲ γε μηδαμοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἀποκρύπτειτο ὁ ποιητής, πᾶσα ἂν αὐτῷ ἄνευ μιμήσεως ἢ ποιήσας τε καὶ διήγησις γεγонуῖα εἴη.

<sup>33</sup> Arist. "*Ars Poetica* 1448a: ὅθεν καὶ δράματα καλεῖσθαι τινες αὐτὰ φασιν, ὅτι μιμοῦνται δρῶντας. Compare the philology of δρᾶν and πράττειν.

as opposed to imitation, turns into *Oratio Obliqua* some examples, as it were, or simple narration of events.<sup>34</sup> The dramatic element comes in when the intermediate passages are omitted and the dialogue alone is left.<sup>35</sup> Tragedy and comedy, Plato thinks, are wholly imitative; while the dithyrambic and certain other kinds of poetry are altogether devoid of imitation. Epic poetry, according to him, falls under Class III of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας, a combination of Class I and II.<sup>36</sup> That poetry and art were a species of μίμησις was an accepted canon in Greece, even before the time of Plato. From this passage, Plato gradually deepens and intensifies the meaning of μίμησις in the *Republic*. Here, however, the word signifies a specific kind of style, the dramatic, as opposed to the narrative.<sup>37</sup> Let us compare with this Aristotles' discussion of the distinctions in art.<sup>38</sup>

In his *Ars Poetica*, we have practically the same divisions that are given by Plato and that are found in the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας of the *Vita Aeschyli*, except that in the *Vita* we have four divisions.

Let us take up now the later works which deal with the divisions of literature. In some, we find three divisions; in others, there are only two; whereas the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας alone has these four divisions.

Compare *Photius e Proclo*, p. 981:

καὶ ὅτι τῆς ποιητικῆς τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ διηγηματικόν, τὸ δὲ μιμητικόν. καὶ τὸ μὲν διηγηματικὸν ἐμφέρεται δι' ἔπους ἰάμβου τε καὶ ἐλεγείας καὶ μέλους, τὸ δὲ μιμητικὸν διὰ τραγωδίας σατύρων τε καὶ κωμωδίας.

Compare also Eustathius, in his commentary to Homer's *Iliad*,

<sup>34</sup> *Rep.*, 393 d.-394 a. and the conclusion, οὕτως, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὃ ἐταίρε, ἄνευ μιμήσεως ἀπλῆ διήγησις γίνεται.

<sup>35</sup> Compare Plato's statement *Rep.*, 394 b.

<sup>36</sup> *Comp. Rep.*, 394 c.

<sup>37</sup> Compare διηγηματικά and ἀπαγγελτικά, as opposed to δραματικά and μιμητικά in section 3. See also Abeken's treatise on the various connotations of μίμησις (*De μίμησις apud Platonem et Aristotelem Notatione*).

<sup>38</sup> Aristotle's *Ars Poetica*, 1448, a.

B, p. 199, where he makes three divisions.<sup>39</sup> τὴν μιμητικὴν, δραματικὴν τὴν ἀμιμητὸν, διηγηματικὴν καὶ μικτὴν.

Plato established these divisions of literature (ποιημάτων) and followed, perhaps, the general opinion of the time concerning art, music, and literature, as a species of μίμησις. Aristotle, although he enlarged on them, followed Plato's classifications.

Of those who wrote works from which such a passage as the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας could have been taken, we know from Suidas that Dicaearchus<sup>40</sup> was a pupil of Aristotle, and that discussions of music and literature greatly pleased both Aristotle and Dicaearchus. Dicaearchus who wrote a μουσικὴ ἱστορία treated at a great length this division of art. He must have, therefore, compiled a book from all the various treatises and discussions of the subject; yet his canons were indubitably Platonic.

Dionysius Minor of Halicarnassus, who may have been the author of this ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας, was necessarily influenced by the works of Aristotle and Dicaearchus, even if he were not directly influenced by the allied references scattered throughout Plato.

Rufus's work was, perhaps, merely an epitome of Dionysius' musical treatise. Yet, whether we accept Dicaearchus, Dionysius Minor, or Rufus, as the most probable author of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας it all probably goes back to Plato's divisions.

### THE AUTHORSHIP

At the end of the *Vita Aeschyli* we have a critical discussion of Aeschylus, brief and imperfect though it be. Since this meager paragraph is found in many manuscripts, and especially in cod. M. of Aeschylus, some inquiry should be instituted as to its author. Before, however, we go into the details and try to find to whom the authorship of this section of the *Vita Aeschyli*

<sup>39</sup> See Aelius Quint. *De Musica*, II p. 87. ποιητικῆς μέρος μὲν μίμησις καὶ διήγησις. Synesius in Cabo makes this comment on μίμησις, and adds the universally accepted opinion of Plato.

<sup>40</sup> See Cicero, *ad Atticum*, II, 2; ib. VI, 2.

should be assigned, I shall state the varying opinions of the few scholars who have discussed these sections of the Vita.

Schoell:<sup>41</sup> Taken from Dionysius Minor of Halicarnassus, or from an epitome of Rufus.

Paley:<sup>42</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or Rufus.

Westermann:<sup>43</sup> Perhaps from Dicaearchus; though Westermann prefers to believe that these three sections were taken from the musical history of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or Rufus.

Ritter:<sup>44</sup> In Ritter's judgment, the preceding sections of the Vita were taken from the commentaries of Didymus, on Aeschylus; but he adds, "iam sequitur alterum ex Musica Historica Dionysii.

Näke: Näke gives four probable authors; Stephanus of Byzantium,<sup>45</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Rufus, and Dicaearchus.

<sup>41</sup> Schoell Frid., *De locis nonnullis ad Aeschyli Vitam et ad Historiam tragoediae graecae pertinentibus epistula*. Gratulationschrift von Rud. und Fr. Schoell zu Geburtst. von Ad. Schoell, S. 37-65. Jena. 1876.

<sup>42</sup> Paley F. A., *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*, (Fourth Edition). London. 1879.

<sup>43</sup> Westermann, *Vita Aeschyli*, but compare Meineke, *Quaestionum Scaenicarum Spectacula*, III. 2. He says that we know of a work by Dicaearchus, known as *περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων*, from the scholia to Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1403.

<sup>44</sup> Ritter, *Didymi Opuscula*, p. 161.

<sup>45</sup> For Stephanus of Byzantium, Näke brings forward Meineke's statement in his *Quaestionum Scaenicarum Spectacula*, Vol. III p. 5-6: "Post Jubam regem Tiberio et Nerone, imperatoribus, floruit Soteridas Epidaurus Pamphilare doctissimae matronae (v. *Prolog. ad Menandr.*, p. XXXIV) pater qui praeter *ὑπομήματα εἰς Μενάνδρον* tribus libris comprehensa, scripsit *περὶ κωμωδίας* testatibus Endoc. p. 387, et Suidas Vol. III. 357, ubi qui testis advocatur Dionysius in *μουσικῇ ἱστορίᾳ* eum non diversum fuisse ab eo quem Suidas s. v. Ἀντιφάνης ubi de Antiphanis comici patria agitur ad patres vocat haut inepte comicas e Steph. Byz. v. Ὑδροεα p. 724, tibi de Euage poeta comico citatur Διονύσιος εἰκοστῷ τρίτῳ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας.

## DICAEOARCHUS

Let us now consider the testimony we have concerning Dicaearchus, and see whether the general character of this *ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας* of the *Vita Aeschyli* could come within the scope of his writings. (Compare Plutarch 1095.5) <sup>46</sup>

ποῖος γὰρ ἂν αὐλὸς ἢ κιθάρα διηρμοσμένη πρὸς ᾠδὴν ἢ τις χόρος εὐρυθῦπα κέλαδον ἀκροσόφρων ἀγνυμένων διὰ σωμαίων φθεγγόμενος, οὕτως ἤφφρανεν ἐπίκουρον καὶ Μητρόδωρον ὡς Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ Θεόφραστον καὶ Ἱερώνομον καὶ Δικαίαρχον οἱ περὶ χορῶν λόγοι καὶ διδασκαλῖαι καὶ τὰ δι' αὐλὸν προβλήματα καὶ ρυθμῶν καὶ ἀρμονιῶν; Suidas gives an account in his Lexicon, of two Dicaearchi.

(1.) Δικαίαρχος Ἰ Λακεδαιμόνιος γραμματικὸς ἀκουστῆς Ἀριστάρχου.

(2.) <sup>47</sup> Δικαίαρχος Φειδίου Σικελιότης ἐκ πόλεως Μεσσήνης. Ἀριστοτέλους ἀκουστῆς φιλοσοφὸς καὶ ρήτωρ καὶ γεωμέτρης.

## DIONYSIUS MINOR OF HALICARNASSUS

From the general character of the *ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας* of the *Vita Aeschyli* and from the opinions of various scholars who have treated this passage, the most plausible theory is to assign the authorship to Dionysius Minor of Halicarnassus, inasmuch as we know, for a certainty, that he wrote a history of Music in thirty-six books.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>46</sup> In his note on this passage, Reiske (ed. Jacob Johanes, Leipsig 1782.), Vol. X. p. 509., says that Dicaearchus' most important work was *περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων* (*περὶ μουσικῆς ἢ περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων*) See also the scholia to Aristophanes, *Birds*, 1403. οἱ δὲ ἀρχαιότεροι Ἑλλανικὸς καὶ Δικαίαρχος κ. τ. λ. . . . Δικαίαρχος μὲν ἐν τῷ περὶ Διονυσιακῶν ἀγώνων Ἑλλανικὸς δὲ ἐν τοῖς Κραναιοῖς.

<sup>47</sup> The Dicaearchus, spoken of in the scholia to Arist., *Birds* 1403, mentioned there in connection with Aristotle, must be number 2 of Suidas.

<sup>48</sup> On the testimony of Suidas in his Lexicon, under the head of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, we know that Dionysius was born under the Emperor Hadrian, and that he wrote, besides the books on music (*Musica Historia*), twenty-four books on *ρυθμικὰ ὑπομνήματα*. Suidas, *Life of Dionysius of Hal.*, p. 299.

Διονύσιος Ἀλικαρνασσεύς, γεγωνὺς ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος, σοφιστῆς



In this *Musica Historia*, he classifies the varieties of music and gives also instructions for obtaining a thorough musical education. There is, of course, no absolute certainty as to whom to assign these sections of the *Vita*, since we have none of the works of either Rufus or Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Even our knowledge of their works and their general characteristics is scant. Knowledge, too, concerning the *Musica Historia* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and his other writings is meager; it would seem, nevertheless, to be the most probable solution, nay, most plausible, to assign this work to Dionysius of Halicarnassus; but if not to him, then following the prevalent opinion to Rufus. If we assign it to Rufus, then this most interesting passage is an excerpt from the first, second, or third book of his ἡ μουσικὴ ἱστορία or from an epitome of this work.<sup>49</sup>

#### RUFUS

Rufus is said to have written a work entitled either ἱστορία δραματικὴ or ἱστορία μουσικὴ.<sup>50</sup> Ritter prefers to accept Diony-

---

καὶ μουσικὸς κληθεὶς διὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ἀσκηθῆναι τὰ τῆς μουσικῆς. ἔγραψε δὲ ρυθμικῶν ὑπομνήματα βιβλία κδ', μουσικῆς ἱστορίας βιβλία λστ, ἐν δὲ τούτοις αὐλητῶν καὶ κιθαρωδῶν καὶ ποιητῶν παντοίων μέμνηται. μουσικῆς παιδείας ἡ διατριβὴν βιβλία κβ' τίνα μουσικῶς εἰρηται ἐν τῇ Πλάτωνος πολιτείᾳ βιβλία ε'.

Other works of Dionysius: A dictionary of Attic words Ἀττικὰ ὀνόματα in five books, dedicated to one Scymnus. See Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod., 152; (περὶ ἀκλιτῶν ρημάτων καὶ ἐγκλινομένων λέξεων) Aldus Manutius, Venice, 1496; μουσικὴ ἱστορία (XXXVI Libri); ρυθμικὰ ὑπομνήματα (XXIV Libri); μουσικῆς παιδεία ἡ διατριβή (XXIII Lib.); a whole work in five books on Plato's *Republic*.

<sup>49</sup> This is on the evidence of Sopater Sophista, who made use of this work in the fourth and fifth books of his *Eclogae*. See Photius, *Bibliotheca*, p. 103, col. II, ll. 16-34. (ed. Bekker).

<sup>50</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca* (ed. Bekker), p. 103.

ὁ δὲ πέμπτος συγκεῖται αὐτῷ ἔκ τε τῆς Ρούφου μουσικῆς ἱστορίας πρώτου καὶ τρίτου βιβλίου, ἐν ᾧ τραγικῶν τε καὶ κωμικῶν ποικίλην ἱστορίαν εὐρήσεις, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἄλλα καὶ διθυραμβοποιῶν τε καὶ αὐλητῶν καὶ κιθαρωδῶν, κ. τ. λ.

His sixth treatise is also gathered together from Bks. IV and V of the same *Musica Historia* of Rufus. See Photius, *Bibliotheca*, p. 103, l. 36 ff.

sus of Halicarnassus<sup>51</sup> as the author rather than Rufus, inasmuch as Rufus's work was, in all probability, not nearly so well known as that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. "There is," he says, "an anonymous codex Parisiensis, which shows such a criticism of comedy taken from Dionysius, and from other sources, too; and that these criticisms, even though of another character, are not dissimilar to the statements that our scribe has written under the head of ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ιστορίας."

It appears from the *Vita Sophoclis*<sup>52</sup> which is similarly constructed and ends with a similar criticism of dramatic art, that Susemihl<sup>53</sup> hesitates to agree with Schoell, who wishes to prove that the *Musica Historia* of the *Vita Aeschlyi* (sections 17-18, in Ritschl) is taken from the *Musica Historia* of Dionysius Minor of Halicarnassus.

The conclusion to be drawn from what few facts we have at our disposal in regard to the authorship of this piece of literary criticism attached to the *Vita Aeschlyi*, entitled ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ιστορίας, must necessarily be ever uncertain. The material offered us by commentators throughout the study of the classics is meager on this point. In addition, a knowledge even of the works from which this treatise could have been taken, or of the epitomes of such works, is scanty. I should prefer to decide in favor of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and not in favor of Rufus. Yet why not Rufus? We have no clue from the manuscripts, and we can not even be certain of the authorship of the preceding sections of the *Vita*, although most critics have agreed that it was indubitably Didymus's. At all events the *Vita* is scarcely in the form in which Didymus wrote it.

WILBUR HIGH ROYSTER.

<sup>51</sup> The preceding sections of the *Vita Aeschlyi* (sections 13-16, Ritschl *Aeschlyi Septem adversus Thebas*, Leipzig, 1875.), Schneidewin and Trendlenburg rightly attribute to Aristophanes of Byzantium; but Susemihl, taking ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ιστορίας as "subscriptio" and not as "inscriptio", does not see how the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ιστορίας could also be attributed to Aristophanes of Byzantium.

<sup>52</sup> The ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ιστορίας of the Sophocles' *Vita* is found in Westermann's *Vitae*, sections, 88-108.

<sup>53</sup> Susemihl F., *De Vita Aeschlyi Quaestiones Epicriticae*, pp. 13-16.